arXiv:1702.01903v2 [math.OC] 9 Feb 2017

Robust Stability of Optimization-based State Estimation Under Bounded Disturbances

Wuhua Hu

***Abstract*—Optimization-based state estimation is useful for nonlinear or constrained dynamic systems for which few general methods with established properties are available. The two fundamental forms are moving horizon estimation (MHE) which uses the nearest measurements within a moving time horizon, and its theoretical ideal, full information estimation (FIE) which uses all measurements up to the time of estimation. Despite extensive studies, the stability analyses of FIE and MHE for discrete-time nonlinear systems with bounded process and measurement disturbances, remain an open challenge. This work aims to provide a systematic solution for the challenge. First, we prove that FIE is robustly globally asymptotically stable (RGAS) if the cost function admits a property mimicking the incremental input/output-to-state stability (i-IOSS) of the system and has a sufficient sensitivity to the uncertainty in the initial state. Second, we establish an explicit link from the RGAS of FIE to that of MHE, and use it to show that MHE is RGAS under enhanced conditions if the moving horizon is long enough to suppress the propagation of uncertainties. The theoretical results imply flexible MHE designs with assured robust stability for a broad class of i-IOSS systems. Numerical experiments on linear and nonlinear systems are used to illustrate the designs and support the findings.**

***Index Terms*—Nonlinear systems; moving-horizon estimation; full information estimation; state estimation; bounded disturbances; robust stability**

I. Introduction

Optimization-based state estimation refers to an estimation method that estimates the state of a system via an optimization approach, in which the optimization utilizes all or a subset of the information available about the system up to the time of estimation. It has advantages in handling nonlinear or constrained systems for which few general state estimation methods with established properties are available [1]. Full information estimation (FIE) is an ideal form of optimization-based estimation which uses all measurements up to the time of estimation. In the absence of constraints, FIE is equivalent to Kalman filtering (KF) when the system is linear time-invariant and the cost function has an appropriate quadratic form [1]. Since the measurements increase with time, it is impractical to implement FIE. This motivates the development of moving horizon estimation (MHE) as its practical approximation which uses only the latest batch of measurements to do the estimation. The idea of MHE dates back to 1960's [2] which was motivated for making KF robust to modeling errors. However, it is not until recently that the idea is gradually developed into a field, i.e., the field of MHE [1], [3]–[5]. The recent developments include MHE theoretical and applied researches which investigate the stability and the implementation issues of MHE, respectively.

Theoretical research has been concentrated on the stability conditions of MHE. Early research assumed linear systems [6]–[8], and later nonlinear systems [9]–[12]. Of them, partial stability results were obtained by assuming the presence of measurement disturbances but the absence of process disturbances, e.g., [10], and most were obtained by assuming the presence of both disturbances, e.g., [6]–[9], [11], [12]. And the stability results were derived based on different formulations of the problems. For example, references [6]–[8], [13], [14] considered either linear or nonlinear systems and each assumed a quadratic cost function that accounts for a quadratic arrival cost and quadratic penalties on the measurement fitting errors. Whereas, references [5], [11], [15]–[17] considered general nonlinear systems and assumed a general form of cost functions that are not necessarily in a quadratic form.

The recent review made in [5] provides a concise and general view of the problem which relies on the concept of incremental input/output-to-state stability (i-IOSS) for detectability of nonlinear systems [18] and the concept of robust global asymptotic stability (RGAS) for robust stability of a state estimator [5], [19]. The review revealed two major challenges that were open in the field [1], [5]: (i) the search for conditions and a proof of the RGAS of MHE in the presence of bounded disturbances, and (ii) the development of suboptimal MHE that enables an efficient computation of the solution. As an initial step to tackling challenge (i), reference [15] identified a broad class of cost functions that ensure the RGAS of FIE, and the cost functions were shown to admit a more specific form for a class of i-IOSS systems considered in [16]. The implication to the RGAS of MHE was further investigated in [17] based on the results of [16], which showed that MHE is RGAS if the same conditions are enhanced properly.

Other relevant progress was reported in [14], which assumed a quadratic cost function and used a nonlinear deterministic observer to generate useful constraints so that the MHE results in bounded estimation errors under certain conditions. Some earlier developments are also available in [12], [13], which assumed a quadratic cost function for MHE and also an observability and some Lipschitz conditions on the system. The other developments of MHE are mainly in applied research, which mostly aimed at reducing the online computational complexity of MHE for applications in large dimensional and nonlinear systems [1]. Interested readers are referred to [20]–[24] and the references therein for relevant examples.

This paper follows the general view of MHE developed in [5], and aims to present a systematic solution for the aforementioned open challenge (i). It significantly extends our

W. Hu is with the Institute for Infocomm Research, Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), Singapore, E-mail: huwh@i2r.a-star.edu.sg

conference paper [15], which identified sufficient conditions for the RGAS of FIE. The major new contributions are the following. First, an explicit link is established from the RGAS of FIE to that of MHE. Second, based on the link we prove the RGAS of MHE under both general and specialized conditions, depending on the stability property of a system. Third, two numerical examples are developed with rigorous analyses to support the theoretical findings. The numerical results are compared with those obtained by KF in the linear case and extended Kalman filter (EKF) [25] in the nonlinear case, demonstrating the advantages of MHE in the considered situations. In addition, the sufficient conditions developed in the conference paper are relaxed slightly without altering the conclusion on the RGAS of FIE. Since the discrete-time system and the MHE are assumed to have general forms, the theoretical results imply flexible MHE designs with assured robust stability for a broad class of systems. This constitutes a key difference from the recent stability analysis on MHE which is restricted to a subset of the considered systems [17].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the notation and some preliminaries. Section III defines the ideal and the practical forms of optimization-based state estimation, i.e., FIE and MHE. Section IV proves the robust stability of FIE under general and then specialized conditions. Section V reveals its implication to MHE and subsequently proves the robust stability of MHE under enhanced conditions. Section VI presents two numerical examples to illustrate the flexible MHE designs. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper with a remark on the future work.

II. Notation and Preliminaries

The notation mostly follows the convention in [5]. The symbols $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ denote the sets of real numbers, nonnegative real numbers and nonnegative integers, respectively, and $\mathbb{I}_{a:b}$ denotes the set of integers from a to b. The constraints $t \geq 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ are used interchangeably to refer to the set of discrete times. The symbol $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of a vector or the 2-norm of a matrix, depending on the argument. The bold symbol $\boldsymbol{x}_{a:b}$, denotes a sequence of vector-valued variables $\{x_a, x_{a+1}, ..., x_b\}$, and with a function f acting on a vector x, $f(\boldsymbol{x}_{a:b})$ stands for the sequence of function values $\{f(x_a), f(x_{a+1}), ..., f(x_b)\}$. The notation $\|\boldsymbol{x}_{a:b}\|$ refers to $\max_{a\leq i\leq b}|x_i|$ if $a \leq b$ and to 0 if $a > b$. Throughout the paper, t refers to a discrete time, and as a subscript it indicates dependence on time t. Whereas, the subscripts or superscripts x, w and v are used exclusively to indicate a function or variable that is associated with the state (x), disturbance (w) or measurement noise (v), and they do not imply dependence relationships. The frequently used $\mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{K}_\infty$, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions are defined as follows.

Definition 1. ($\mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{K}_\infty$, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions) A function $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is an $\mathcal{K}$ function if it is continuous, zero at zero, and strictly increasing, and an $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ function if α is an $\mathcal{K}$ function and satisfies $\alpha(s) \to \infty$ as $s \to \infty$. A function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is an $\mathcal{L}$ function if it is continuous, nonincreasing and satisfies $\varphi(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. A function $\beta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is an $\mathcal{KL}$ function if, for each $t \geq 0$, $\beta(\cdot, t)$ is an $\mathcal{K}$ function and for each $s \geq 0$, $\beta(s, \cdot)$ is an $\mathcal{L}$ function.

The following properties of the $\mathcal{K}$- and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions will be used in later analyses.

Lemma 1. *[5], [26] Given an $\mathcal{K}$ function α and an $\mathcal{KL}$ function β, the following holds for all $a_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $i \in \mathbb{I}_{1:n}$, and all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,*

$$\alpha\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha(n a_i),\ \beta\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i, t\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta(n a_i, t).$$

Definition 2. (i-IOSS [5], [18]) The system $x_{t+1} = f(x_t, w_t)$, $y_t = h(x_t)$ is i-IOSS if there exist functions $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that for every two initial states $x_0^{(1)}, x_0^{(2)}$, and two sequences of disturbances $\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(2)}$, the following inequality holds for all $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|x_t(x_0^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(1)}) - x_t(x_0^{(2)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(2)})\right| &\leq \beta(\left|x_0^{(1)} - x_0^{(2)}\right|, t) \\ + \alpha_1(\left\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(2)}\right\|) &+ \alpha_2(\left\|h(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t}^{(1)}) - h(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t}^{(2)})\right\|). \quad (1)\end{aligned}$$

The definition of i-IOSS can be interpreted as a "detectability" concept for nonlinear systems [18], as the state may be "detected" from the *noise-free* output by (1).

In particular, if in (1) $\beta(s, t) = \alpha(s)a^t$ for all $s, t \geq 0$, with $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ and a being a constant within $(0, 1)$, we say that the system is *exponentially i-IOSS* or *exp-i-IOSS* for short. This can be viewed as extending the exponential input-to-state stability [27], [28] to the context of i-IOSS.

Definition 3. ($\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function) An $\mathcal{KL}$ function β is called an $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function if there exist functions $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\beta(s, t) = \alpha(s)\varphi(t)$, for all $s, t \geq 0$.

As an example, the $\mathcal{KL}$ function se^{-t} is an $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function for $s, t \geq 0$. The next lemma shows the general interest of an $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function.

Lemma 2. *($\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ bound) Given an arbitrary $\mathcal{KL}$ function β, there exists an $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function $\bar{\beta}$ such that $\beta(s, t) \leq \bar{\beta}(s, t)$ for all $s, t \geq 0$.*

Proof: By Lemma 8 in [29], given an arbitrary $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$, there exist two functions $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that $\beta(s, t) \leq \alpha_1(s)\alpha_2(e^{-t}) =: \bar{\beta}(s, t)$ for all $s, t \geq 0$. Since $\bar{\beta}(s, t)$ is an $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function in s and t, this completes the proof. ■

Lemma 2 implies that the i-IOSS property defined by means of an $\mathcal{KL}$ function can be defined equivalently using an $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function. This is useful in the later analyses of FIE and MHE.

III. Optimization-based State Estimation

Consider a discrete-time nonlinear system described by

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, w_t),\ y_t = h(x_t) + v_t, \quad (2)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the system state, $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the measurement, $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^g$ the process disturbance, $v_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the measurement disturbance, all at time t. A control input known up to the present time can easily be included but is ignored for brevity in the formulation of the state estimation [5]. The functions

f ,and h are assumed to be continuous and known, and the initial state x_0 and the disturbances (w_t, v_t) are modeled as unknown but *bounded* variables.

At any present time t, the state estimation problem is to find an optimal estimate of state x_t based on measurements $\{y_\tau\}$ for τ belonging to a time set and satisfying $\tau \leq t$. This can be casted as an optimization problem. In the ideal case, all measurements up to time t are used, leading to the so-called FIE; and in the practical case, only measurements within a limited distance from the present time are used, yielding the so-called MHE. FIE is of interest mainly for its theoretical value: its performance can be viewed as a limit or benchmark that MHE tries to approach, and its stability can be a good start point for the stability analysis of MHE, which will become clear later on. The specific optimization forms of FIE and MHE are defined next.

Let the decision variables be $(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{0:t}, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t})$, which correspond to the system variables $(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t}, \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{v}_{0:t})$, and the optimal decision variables be $(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{0:t}, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}, \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0:t})$. Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_{0:t}$, which consists of optimal estimates at all sampled times, is uniquely determined once $\hat{x}_0$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}$ are known, the decision variables essentially reduce to $(\boldsymbol{\chi}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t})$. (Although $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}$ is uniquely determined by $\boldsymbol{\chi}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}$, we keep it to indicate the explicit dependence of a cost later defined on $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}$.) Let t be the current time, and $\bar{x}_0$ be the prior estimate of the initial state which may be obtained from the initial or historical measurements. The uncertainty in the initial state is thus represented by $\chi_0 - \bar{x}_0$. Denote the time-dependent cost function as $V_t(\chi_0 - \bar{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t})$, which penalizes uncertainties in the initial state, the process and the measurements. Then, FIE is defined as the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FIE}: \ & \inf V_t(\chi_0 - \bar{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}) \\ \text{subject to}, \ & \chi_{\tau+1} = f(\chi_\tau, \omega_\tau), \ \forall \tau \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t-1}, \\ & y_\tau = h(\chi_\tau) + \nu_\tau, \ \forall \tau \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t}, \\ & \chi_0 \in \mathbb{B}_0, \ \boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1} \in \mathbb{B}_w, \ \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t} \in \mathbb{B}_v, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\{\chi_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}\}$ are the decision variables, $\mathbb{B}_0$ denotes the set of bounded initial states, and $\mathbb{B}_w$ and $\mathbb{B}_v$ denote the sets of bounded sequences of process and measurement disturbances, respectively. Given a constant $T \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, if the measurements are limited only to the $T+1$ measurements backwards from and including the present time t, then the following optimization defines MHE, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MHE}: \ & \inf V_t(\chi_{t-T} - \bar{x}_{t-T}, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}) \\ \text{subject to}, \ & \chi_{\tau+1} = f(\chi_\tau, \omega_\tau), \ \forall \tau \in \mathbb{I}_{t-T:t-1}, \\ & y_\tau = h(\chi_\tau) + \nu_\tau, \ \forall \tau \in \mathbb{I}_{t-T:t}, \\ & \boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1} \in \mathbb{B}_w, \ \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t} \in \mathbb{B}_v, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\{\chi_{t-T}, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}\}$ are the decision variables, and $\bar{x}_{t-T}$ is a prior estimate of x_{t-T}. Since the cost function is in the same form of FIE except for the truncated argument variables, the MHE defined in (4) is named as the *associated MHE* of the FIE defined in (3), and vice versa. In MHE, the tube $(\hat{x}_t, \hat{w}_t, \hat{v}_t)$ refers to the *online* estimates adopted for time t. *Offline* state estimates obtained using measurements before and after the state time, if any, will be represented by other notation that is specific to the context.

An important issue in designing FIE and MHE is to identify conditions under which the associated optimizations have optimal solutions such that the state estimates satisfy the RGAS property defined below. Let $\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t}(x_0, \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1})$ denote a state sequence generated from an initial condition x_0, and a disturbance sequence $\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}$.

Definition 4. (RGAS [5]) The estimate $\hat{x}_t$ of the state x_t is based on partial or full sequence of the noisy measurements, $\boldsymbol{y}_{0:t} = h(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t}(x_0, \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1})) + \boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}$. The estimate is RGAS if for all x_0 and $\bar{x}_0$, there exist functions $\beta_x \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\alpha_w, \alpha_v \in \mathcal{K}$ such that the following inequality holds for all $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1} \in \mathbb{B}_w$, $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t} \in \mathbb{B}_v$ and $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & |x_t - \hat{x}_t| \\ & \leq \beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Note that, the last measurement y_t and hence the corresponding fitting error v_t are considered in the above inequality, which is however absent in the original definition [5]. To have FIE or MHE that is RGAS, the cost function needs to penalize the uncertainties appropriately, and meanwhile the system dynamics should satisfy certain conditions. We present such sufficient conditions for FIE and MHE in sequence in the next two sections.

IV. Robust Stability of FIE

The following two assumptions are introduced for establishing the robust stability of FIE.

Assumption IV.1. Given any $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, define the cost function of FIE as: $V_t(\chi_0 - \bar{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}) = \rho_x(|\chi_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t})$, where $\rho_x \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\bar{V}_t$ is a continuous function which satisfies the following inequalities for all $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1} \in \mathbb{B}_w$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t} \in \mathbb{B}_v$:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}\|) \leq \bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}) \\ \leq \gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1}\|) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}\|), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\alpha_w, \alpha_v, \gamma_w, \gamma_v \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

Assumption IV.2. The $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions in (1)-(6) satisfy the following inequalities for all $s_x, s_w, s_v, t \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta\left(s_x + \gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(\rho_x(s_x, t) + \gamma_w(s_w) + \gamma_v(s_v)\right), t\right) \\ & \leq \bar{\beta}_x(s_x, t) + \bar{\alpha}_w(s_w) + \bar{\alpha}_v(s_v), \end{aligned}$$

in which $\gamma_{x,t}(s) := \rho_x(s, t)$ and $\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}(\cdot)$ is its inverse function, and $\bar{\beta}_x$, $\bar{\alpha}_w$ and $\bar{\alpha}_v$ are proper $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions, respectively.

If we interpret the cost function V_t as to measure the deviation of the state estimate of a disturbed system from the true state of the undisturbed system, then Assumption IV.1 basically requires that the deviation is both lower and upper bounded by i-IOSS like limits. The assumption ensures that the FIE has sufficient sensitivity to the involved uncertainties, and that the sensitivity presents a pattern which mimics the i-IOSS property of the system. Assumption IV.2 requires that the FIE is more sensitive than the system to the uncertainty in

the initial state, in order to yield the desired i-IOSS like bounds and consequently establishes the robust stability. Next, we prove the robust stability of FIE under these two assumptions.

Theorem 1. *(RGAS of FIE) The FIE defined in* (3) *is RGAS if the three conditions are satisfied: 1) the system described in* (2) *is i-IOSS, 2) the cost function of the FIE satisfies Assumptions IV.1-IV.2, and 3) the infimum of the optimization in the FIE is attainable.*

Proof: Let the global optimal solution of the FIE yield a minimum cost denoted by V_t^o. It follows that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^o &= V_t(\hat{x}_0 - \bar{x}_0,\, \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1},\, \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0:t}) \\ &\leq V_t(x_0 - \bar{x}_0,\, \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1},\, \boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}) =: \tilde{V}_t. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption IV.1 we have

$$\tilde{V}_t \leq \rho_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|).$$

And with $\gamma_{x,\,t}(|\hat{x}_0 - \bar{x}_0|) := \rho_x(|\hat{x}_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \leq V_t^o \leq \tilde{V}_t$, we have $|\hat{x}_0 - \bar{x}_0| \leq \gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}(\tilde{V}_t)$. By using the triangle inequality and the above inequality, this further leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |x_0 - \hat{x}_0| &\leq |x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + |\hat{x}_0 - \bar{x}_0| \\ &\leq |x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \gamma_{x,\,t}^{-1}\left(\begin{array}{c} \rho_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \\ +\gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \end{array} \right). \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Next we derive a bound for the term $\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}\|$. From the triangle inequality we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\| + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}\|\,.$$

Since $\alpha_w(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}\|) \leq V_t^o \leq \tilde{V}_t$, it implies that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}\| \leq \alpha_w^{-1}(\tilde{V}_t)$. It follows from the above inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{0:t-1}\| \\ &\leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\| + \alpha_w^{-1}\left(\begin{array}{c} \rho_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \\ +\gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \end{array} \right) \\ &\leq \rho_x^w(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\| \\ &\quad + \gamma_w^w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \gamma_v^w(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\rho_x^w := \alpha_w^{-1} \circ 3\rho_x$, $\gamma_w^w := \alpha_w^{-1} \circ 3\gamma_w$ and $\gamma_v^w := \alpha_w^{-1} \circ 3\gamma_v$ which are $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions, respectively. By applying the same reasoning to $\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t} - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0:t}\|$, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t} - \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_{0:t}\| &\leq \rho_x^v(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) \\ &\quad + \|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\| + \gamma_w^v(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \gamma_v^v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\rho_x^v := \alpha_v^{-1} \circ 3\rho_x$, $\gamma_w^v := \alpha_v^{-1} \circ 3\gamma_w$ and $\gamma_v^v := \alpha_v^{-1} \circ 3\gamma_v$, which are $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ functions, respectively

Substitute (7)-(9) into (1), namely, the i-IOSS inequality of the system, yielding (10) in which β_x, α_w and α_v are $\mathcal{KL}$, $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ functions, respectively. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &|x_t - \hat{x}_t| \\ &\leq \beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|\,,\, t) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the FIE is RGAS by definition. This completes the proof. ∎

Remark 1. As shown in [15], FIE can prove to converge to the true state when the disturbances are convergent to zero if the feasible sets $\mathbb{B}_w$ and $\mathbb{B}_v$ restrict the disturbances estimates to be convergent to zero. However, it is unclear if there exists such a form of cost function that the conclusion remains true without imposing the restriction.

A specific form of the sub-cost function $\bar{V}_t$ that satisfies Assumption IV.1 is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1},\, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}) &:= \frac{\lambda_w}{t} \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t-1}} l_{w,\tau}(\omega_\tau) + \frac{\lambda_v}{t+1} \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t}} l_{v,\tau}(\nu_\tau) \\ &\quad + (1-\lambda_w) \max_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t-1}} l_{w,\tau}(\omega_\tau) + (1-\lambda_v) \max_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t}} l_{w,\tau}(\nu_\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for given constants $\lambda_w,\, \lambda_v \in [0,\, 1)$, in which the functions $l_{w,\tau}$ and $l_{v,\tau}$ satisfy the following inequalities for all $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1} \in \mathbb{B}_w$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t} \in \mathbb{B}_v$:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}'_w(|\omega_\tau|) \leq l_{w,\tau}(\omega_\tau) \leq \gamma'_w(|\omega_\tau|), \\ \underline{\alpha}'_v(|\nu_\tau|) \leq l_{v,\tau}(\nu_\tau) \leq \gamma'_v(|\nu_\tau|), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\underline{\alpha}'_w,\, \underline{\alpha}'_v,\, \gamma'_w,\, \gamma'_v \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. In the sub-cost function, the terms associated with ω_τ vanish if $t = 0$. The sub-cost function ρ_x, which is used to penalize the uncertainty in the initial state, admits more specific forms that are closely related to the $\mathcal{KL}$ function β used in describing the i-IOSS property of the system. Two specific forms of ρ_x can be derived for two types of i-IOSS systems as motivated by the next corollary.

Notice that Assumption IV.2 is rather general. By using the $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ function introduced in Definition 3, more specific conditions can be derived which admit easier interpretations.

Corollary 1. *The FIE defined in* (3) *is RGAS if the following three conditions are satisfied: a) the system given in* (2) *is i-IOSS; b) the FIE's cost function satisfies Assumption IV.1, and the infimum of the associated optimization is attainable; and c) the $\mathcal{KL}$ functions β in* (1) *and ρ_x in* (6) *are $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ functions in the form of $\beta(s,\, t) = \mu_1(s)\varphi_1(t)$ and $\rho_x(s,\, t) = \mu_2(s)\varphi_2(t)$, with $\mu_1,\, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{L}$, and further for any $\pi \in \mathcal{K}$ there exists $\pi' \in \mathcal{K}$ such that*

$$\mu_1\left(3\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi(s)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right)\right)\varphi_1(t) \leq \pi'(s) \quad (13)$$

which holds for all $s,\, t \geq 0$.

Proof: By Theorem 1, it is sufficient to show that Assumption IV.2 is satisfied under the given condition c). With $\gamma_{x,\,t}(s) := \rho_x(s,\, t) = \mu_2(s)\varphi_2(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta\left(3s_x + 3\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s_x,\, t)\right),\, t\right) \\ &= \beta\left(3s_x + 3\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{3\rho_x(s_x,\, t)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right),\, t\right) \\ &= \beta\left(3s_x + 3\mu_2^{-1}\left(3\mu_2(s_x)\right),\, t\right) =: \bar{\beta}_x(s_x,\, t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\beta}_x \in \mathcal{KL}$. With $\beta(s,t) = \mu_1(s)\varphi_1(t)$ and inequality (13), we also have,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta\left(3\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_w(s_w)\right),\, t\right) &= \mu_1\left(3\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{3\gamma_w(s_w)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right)\right)\varphi_1(t) \\ &\leq \bar{\alpha}_w(s_w), \end{aligned}$$

for some function $\bar{\alpha}_w \in \mathcal{K}$. Similarly we have $\beta\left(3\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_v(s_v)\right),\, t\right) \leq \bar{\alpha}_v(s_v)$, for some function $\bar{\alpha}_v \in \mathcal{K}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
|x_t-\hat{x}_t| &\le \beta\left(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|+\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(\rho_x(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|,\,t)+\gamma_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|)+\gamma_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right),\,t\right)\\
&\quad+\alpha_1\left(\rho_x^w(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|,\,t)+\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|+\gamma_w^w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|)+\gamma_v^w(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right)\\
&\quad+\alpha_2\left(\rho_x^v(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|,\,t)+\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|+\gamma_w^v(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|)+\gamma_v^v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right)\\
&\overset{\text{Assump. IV.2}}{\le} \underbrace{\bar{\beta}_x\left(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|,\,t\right)+\alpha_1\left(3\rho_x^w(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|,\,t)\right)+\alpha_2\left(3\rho_x^v(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|,\,t)\right)}_{\beta_x(|x_0-\bar{x}_0|,\,t)}\\
&\quad+\underbrace{\bar{\alpha}_w\left(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|\right)+\alpha_1\left(3\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|+3\gamma_w^w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|)\right)+\alpha_2\left(3\gamma_w^v(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|)\right)}_{\alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|)}\\
&\quad+\underbrace{\bar{\alpha}_v\left(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|\right)+\alpha_1\left(3\gamma_v^w(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right)+\alpha_2\left(3\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|+3\gamma_v^v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right)}_{\alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{10}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\beta\left(s_x+\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(\rho_x(s_x,\,t)+\gamma_w(s_w)+\gamma_v(s_v)\right),\,t\right)\\
&\le \beta\left(\begin{array}{c} s_x+\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s_x,\,t)\right)\\ +\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_w(s_w)\right)+\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_v(s_v)\right)\end{array},\,t\right)\\
&\le \beta\left(3s_x+3\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s_x,\,t)\right),\,t\right)\\
&\quad+\beta\left(3\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_w(s_w)\right),\,t\right)+\beta\left(3\gamma_{x,t}^{-1}\left(3\gamma_v(s_v)\right),\,t\right)\\
&\le \bar{\beta}_x(s_x,\,t)+\bar{\alpha}_w(s_w)+\bar{\alpha}_v(s_v).
\end{aligned}
$$

The last inequity means that Assumption IV.2 is satisfied. Together with the conditions in a) and b), it establishes the conclusion by using Theorem 1. ∎

In condition c) of Corollary 1, the assumption of β being an $\mathcal{K}\cdot\mathcal{L}$ function is trivial because it is always feasible to assign such a function as an alternative if the original $\mathcal{KL}$ function β is not in an $\mathcal{K}\cdot\mathcal{L}$ form (cf. Lemma 2). The condition that ρ_x in (6) is $\mathcal{K}\cdot\mathcal{L}$ functions is not on the system dynamics, but a requirement imposed on the cost function of FIE. The key condition thus boils down to (13), which requires FIE to be sufficiently sensitive (as compared to the system) to the uncertainty in the initial state. This is intuitive because otherwise the estimator will not be able to detect the effect caused by the initial uncertainty and consequently fail to accurately reconstruct the initial state.

Based on Corollary 1, the FIE admits a even more specific cost function if the system is i-IOSS as per (1) in which the $\mathcal{KL}$ bound has a polynomial form.

Corollary 2. *The FIE defined in* (3) *is RGAS, if the following conditions are satisfied:*

a) the system (2) *is i-IOSS with the $\mathcal{KL}$ bound explicitly given as $\beta(s,t)=c_1s^{a_1}(t+1)^{-b_1}$ for some constants $c_1,a_1,b_1>0$ and all $s,t\ge 0$;*

b) the infimum of the optimization in FIE is attainable when the cost function is defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_t(\mathcal{X}_0-\bar{x}_0,\,\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1},\,\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}) &= c_2|\mathcal{X}_0-\bar{x}_0|^{a_2}(t+1)^{-b_2}\\
&\quad+\bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{0:t-1},\,\boldsymbol{\nu}_{0:t}),
\end{aligned}
$$

where a_2, b_2 and c_2 are positive constants, and the sub-cost function $\bar{V}_t$ is continuous and satisfies inequality (6)*;*

c) the parameters a_2 and b_2 satisfy $\frac{a_2}{b_2}\ge\frac{a_1}{b_1}$.

Proof: It is straightforward to show that the cost function given above satisfies Assumption IV.1, in which the $\mathcal{KL}$ function is explicitly given as $\rho_x(|\chi_0-\bar{x}_0|,t):=c_2|\chi_0-\bar{x}_0|^{a_2}(t+1)^{-b_2}$. This function is in the form of $\mu_2(s)\varphi_2(t)$, with $\mu_2(s):=c_2s^{a_2}$ and $\varphi_2(t):=(t+1)^{-b_2}$. By condition a), the $\mathcal{KL}$ bound in the i-IOSS property of the system is given as $\beta(s,\,t)=\mu_1(s)\varphi_1(t)$, with $\mu_1(s):=c_1s^{a_1}$ and $\varphi_1(t):=(t+1)^{-b_1}$. Then for any function $\pi\in\mathcal{K}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mu_1\left(3\mu_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi(s)}{\varphi_2(t)}\right)\right)\varphi_1(t)\\
&=c_1\left(3\left(\frac{1}{c_2}\pi(s)(t+1)^{b_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{a_2}}\right)^{a_1}(t+1)^{-b_1}\\
&=3^{a_1}c_1c_2^{-\frac{a_1}{a_2}}(\pi(s))^{\frac{a_1}{a_2}}(t+1)^{\frac{a_1b_2}{a_2}-b_1}\\
&\overset{\text{cond. c)}}{\le} 3^{a_1}c_1c_2^{-\frac{a_1}{a_2}}(\pi(s))^{\frac{a_1}{a_2}}=:\pi'(s),
\end{aligned}
$$

where π' is an $\mathcal{K}$ function. Hence the condition c) of Corollary 1 is satisfied. Since the conditions a) and b) there are also satisfied, the FIE is RGAS by Corollary 1. ∎

Conditions b)-c) of Corollary 2 are manifestations of the general conditions given in Theorem 1 subject to the condition a) here. This corollary recovers the main result in [16] if the design parameter b_2 is fixed to 1 (with a minor difference that here the FIE is able to utilize the last measurement in the estimation, whose fitting error is penalized through $\nu(t)$).

Moreover, if the system described in (2) is exp-i-IOSS, then the conclusion remains valid by replacing the polynomial $\mathcal{KL}$ bound in Corollary 2 with an exponential form of bound.

Corollary 3. *The FIE defined in* (3) *is RGAS, if the following three conditions are satisfied: a) the system* (2) *is exp-i-IOSS with the $\mathcal{KL}$ function being given as $\beta(s,\,t)=c_1s^{a_1}b_1^t$ for some constants $c_1,a_1>0$ and $0<b_1<1$ and all $s,t\ge 0$; b) the condition b) of Corollary 2 is satisfied with the factor $(t+1)^{-b_2}$ being replaced with b_2^t and subject to $0<b_2<1$; and c) the positive parameters a_2 and b_2 satisfy $\sqrt[a_2]{b_2}\ge\sqrt[a_1]{b_1}$.*

Proof: The proof follows a similar routine of the proof for Corollary 2, and is omitted for brevity. ∎

In condition c) of Corollary 3, the constraint $b_2<1$ is required to make sure that $c_2s^{a_2}b_2^t$ is an $\mathcal{KL}$ function of s and t, so as to satisfy Assumption IV.1 of Theorem 1.

By Corollary 3, it is valid to specify the sub-cost defined on the initial state as $c_2|\mathcal{X}_0-\bar{x}_0|^{a_2}b_2^t$, for positive $\{a_2,b_2,c_2\}$

satisfying $b_2 < 1$ and $\sqrt[\alpha_2]{b_2} \geq \sqrt[\alpha_1]{b_1}$. While, the sub-cost defined on the disturbances can maintain the form of (11).

Remark 2. As shown in [30], the set of exponentially stable systems are dense in the whole set of asymptotically stable systems. So it seems not to lose generality to focus on exp-i-IOSS systems in practice as assumed in Corollary 3.

V. Robust Stability of MHE

At any discrete time, MHE can be interpreted as an instance of the associated FIE whose initial time is the start time of a horizon over which the MHE is currently defined. Thus, the associated FIE being RGAS implies that the MHE is *locally* RGAS over each individual optimization horizon. The challenge reduces to identifying the conditions under which the *local* RGAS implies the RGAS of MHE.

To that end, we need another assumption on the prior estimate of the initial state of a presently defined MHE.

Assumption V.1. Given any time $t \geq T$, the prior estimate $\bar{x}_{t-T}$ of x_{t-T} satisfies the following constraint:

$$|x_{t-T} - \bar{x}_{t-T}| \leq |x_{t-T} - \hat{x}_{t-T}|.$$

The assumption is satisfied if $\bar{x}_{t-T}$ is set to the MHE estimate $\hat{x}_{t-T}$ which was obtained at time $t-T$. Alternatively, a better $\bar{x}_{t-T}$ might be obtained with smoothing techniques which use measurements both before and after time $t-T$ [31]. The next lemma links the robust stability and convergence of MHE with those of its associated FIE.

Lemma 3. *(Stability link from FIE to MHE) Consider the MHE under Assumption V.1. Let the uncertainty in the initial state be bounded as $|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| \leq M_0$, and the disturbances be bounded as $|w_t| \leq M_w$ and $|v_t| \leq M_v$ for all $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Given a constant $\eta \in (0, 1)$, define $\bar{s} = M_0 + \frac{1}{1-\eta}(\alpha_w(M_w) + \alpha_v(M_v))$ and $\bar{s}' = M_0$. Then, the following two conclusions hold:*

a) If the associated FIE is RGAS as per (5)*, in which the $\mathcal{KL}$ function β_x satisfies $\beta_x(s, t) \leq \mu(s)\varphi(t)$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{K}$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ and all $s \in [0, \bar{s}]$, $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, and if the minimum of $\frac{\eta s}{\mu(s)}$ over $s \in [0, \bar{s}]$ exists and is positive, then the MHE is RGAS for all $T \geq T_{\bar{s},\eta}$, where $T_{\bar{s},\eta} := \varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{\eta s^*}{\mu(s^*)}\right)$ and $s^* := \arg\min_{s\in[0,\,\bar{s}]} \frac{\eta s}{\mu(s)}$.*

b) If the associated FIE estimate ($\hat{x}'_t$) converges to the true state, i.e., the estimate satisfies $|x_t - \hat{x}'_t| \leq \rho'(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) \leq \mu'(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|)\varphi'(t)$ for some $\rho' \in \mathcal{KL}$, $\mu' \in \mathcal{K}$, $\varphi' \in \mathcal{L}$ and all $s \in [0, \bar{s}']$, $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, and if the minimum of $\frac{\eta s}{\mu'(s)}$ over $s \in [0, \bar{s}']$ exists and is positive, then the MHE estimate ($\hat{x}_t$) converges to the true state for all $T \geq T_{\bar{s}',\eta}$, where $T_{\bar{s}',\eta} := \varphi'^{-1}(\frac{\eta s^\star}{\mu(s^\star)})$ and $s^\star := \arg\min_{s\in[0,\,\bar{s}']} \frac{\eta s}{\mu'(s)}$.

Proof: a) *RGAS.* Let $\hat{x}_t$ be the MHE estimate of x_t obtained at time $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Treat the MHE defined at time T as the associated FIE confined to the period $[0, T]$. Thus, the MHE satisfies the RGAS property in this period, that is, by (5) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&|x_T - \hat{x}_T| \\
&\leq \beta_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, T) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:T-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:T}\|) \\
&\leq \mu(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|)\varphi(T) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi(T)$ decreases with T, for all $T \geq T_{\bar{s},\eta}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|x_T - \hat{x}_T| &\leq \mu(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|)\varphi(T_{\bar{s},\eta}) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \\
&\leq \eta\,|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the definition of $T_{\bar{s},\eta}$. Repeat the above reasoning for the MHE defined at time $2T$ with $T \geq T_{\bar{s},\eta}$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
&|x_{2T} - \hat{x}_{2T}| \\
&\leq \beta_x(|x_T - \bar{x}_T|, T) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{T:2T-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{T:2T}\|) \\
&\overset{\text{Assump. V.1}}{\leq} \beta_x(|x_T - \hat{x}_T|, T) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \\
&\leq \beta_x\left(\eta\,|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|), T\right) \\
&\quad + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \\
&\leq \mu\left(\eta\,|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right)\varphi(T_{\bar{s},\eta}) \\
&\quad + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \\
&\leq \eta\left(\eta\,|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right) \\
&\quad + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \\
&= \eta^2\,|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + (1+\eta)\left(\alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Given any $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, define $n = \left\lfloor \frac{t}{T} \right\rfloor$, which is the largest integer that is less than or equal to $\frac{t}{T}$. By induction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&|x_{nT} - \hat{x}_{nT}| \\
&\leq \eta^n\,|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \eta^i \left(\alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right) \\
&\leq \eta^{\left\lfloor \frac{t}{T} \right\rfloor}\,|x_0 - \bar{x}_0| + \frac{1}{1-\eta}\left(\alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|)\right) \\
&=: \beta'_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \alpha'_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha'_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $T \geq T_{\bar{s},\eta}$, where $\beta'_x \in \mathcal{KL}$ and α'_w, $\alpha'_v \in \mathcal{K}$. If $t = nT$, then the above relation proves that MHE is RGAS for all $T \geq T_{\bar{s},\eta}$. Otherwise, the proof can be closed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|x_t - \hat{x}_t| &\leq \beta_x(|x_{nT} - \hat{x}_{nT}|, t - nT) \\
&\quad + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{nT:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{nT:t}\|) \\
&\leq \beta_x\left(\beta'_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \alpha'_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha'_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|), 0\right) \\
&\quad + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \\
&\leq \beta_x\left(3\beta'_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t), 0\right) + \beta_x\left(3\alpha'_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|), 0\right) \\
&\quad + \beta_x\left(3\alpha'_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|), 0\right) + \alpha_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|) \\
&=: \beta''_x(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) + \alpha''_w(\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}\|) + \alpha''_v(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{0:t}\|),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta''_x \in \mathcal{KL}$ and α''_w, $\alpha''_v \in \mathcal{K}$, each of which combines functions of the same variables.

b) *Convergence.* If the associated FIE estimate ($\hat{x}'_t$) converges to the true state, then by Lemma 4.5 of [26] and Lemma 2 in Section II, there exist $\rho' \in \mathcal{KL}$, $\mu' \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\varphi' \in \mathcal{L}$ such that

$$|x_t - \hat{x}'_t| \leq \rho'(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t) \leq \mu'(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|)\varphi'(t),$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Continue the proof per part a) but with the $\mathcal{KL}$ function $\beta_x(s, t)$ replaced with $\rho'(s, t)$ and the $\mathcal{K}$ functions α_w and α_v set to zero. We reach the conclusion that $|x_t - \hat{x}_t| \leq \varrho(|x_0 - \bar{x}_0|, t)$ for some $\varrho \in \mathcal{KL}$, if $T \geq T_{\bar{s},\eta}$. This implies

that the MHE estimate ($\hat{x}_t$) converges to the true state (x_t), which completes the proof. ∎

Lemma 3 indicates that the robust stability of MHE is implied by the *enhanced* robust stability of its associated FIE. The enhancing condition requires the moving horizon size (T) to be large enough such that the inequality, $\mu(s)\varphi(T) \leq \eta s$, holds true when the initial state estimation error (s) takes a value within a bounded range. (The lower bound on T can be less conservative if the size of the moving horizon adapts to the variable s while keeping the inequality satisfied.) Since $0 < \eta < 1$, the condition basically requires the MHE to be based on sufficient measurements so that the estimation error is well controlled over time.

The conditions of Lemma 3 become more specific if the $\mathcal{K}$ function μ and μ' have special forms. For example, if $\mu(s) = \mu'(s) = c_1 s^{a_1}$ with $a_1 \geq 1$ and $c_1 > 0$, then the conditions of conclusion a) reduce to that $T \geq T_{\bar{s},\eta}$, with $T_{\bar{s},\eta} := \varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{\eta}{c_1 \bar{s}^{a_1-1}}\right)$, which degenerates to $T_{\bar{s},\eta} := \varphi^{-1}(\frac{\eta}{c_1})$ if $a_1 = 1$, and meanwhile the conditions of conclusion b) reduce to $T \geq T_{\bar{s}',\eta}$, with $T_{\bar{s}',\eta} := \varphi'^{-1}(\frac{\eta}{c_1 \bar{s}'^{a_1-1}})$, which degenerates to $T_{\bar{s},\eta} := \varphi'^{-1}(\frac{\eta}{c_1})$ if $a_1 = 1$. Note that, if $0 \leq a_1 < 1$ in these two cases, the minimum values of $\frac{\eta s}{\mu(s)}$ and $\frac{\eta s}{\mu'(s)}$ are equal to zero and hence the conditions of Lemma 3 are not satisfied and consequently the RGAS of MHE may not follow.

With the explicit link established between the stability of MHE and that of its associated FIE, we are able to prove the RGAS of MHE by enhancing the conditions that establish the RGAS of FIE. In the following, the symbol $\bar{s}$ remains to be the constant defined in Lemma 3.

Theorem 2. *(RGAS of MHE) Suppose that the system described in* (2) *is i-IOSS and the infimum of the MHE defined in* (4) *is attainable. Given Assumption V.1 and any $\eta \in (0,\, 1)$, the MHE is RGAS for all $T \geq T_{\eta,\bar{s}}$ if its associated FIE satisfies Assumptions IV.1-IV.2 and the involved $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{KL}$ functions satisfy*

$$\bar{\beta}_x(s,\, T_{\eta,\bar{s}}) + \alpha_1\left(3\gamma_w^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s,\, T_{\eta,\bar{s}})\right)\right) + \alpha_2\left(3\gamma_v^{-1}\left(3\rho_x(s,\, T_{\eta,\bar{s}})\right)\right) \leq \eta s, \quad (14)$$

for all $s \in [0,\, \bar{s}]$ and $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$.

Proof: Under the conditions excluding Assumption V.1 and inequality (14), the FIE associated with the MHE is RGAS by Theorem 1. By the proof of Theorem 1 and referring to inequality (10) in particular, the key $\mathcal{KL}$ bound function is obtained as $\beta_x(s,\, t) = \bar{\beta}_x(s,\, t) + \alpha_1(3\rho_x^w(s,\, t)) + \alpha_2(3\rho_x^v(s,\, t))$. Together with $\rho_x^w = \gamma_w^{-1} \circ 3\rho_x$, $\rho_x^v = \gamma_v^{-1} \circ 3\rho_x$ and inequality (14), this implies that $\beta_x(s,\, t) \leq \eta s$. Consequently the conclusion follows from conclusion a) of Lemma 3. ∎

Corollary 4. *Given Assumption V.1 and any $\eta \in (0,\, 1)$, the MHE is RGAS for all $T \geq T_{\eta,\bar{s}}$ if its associated FIE satisfies conditions a)-c) of Corollary 1 in which the $\mathcal{K}$ functions $\{\mu_1,\, \mu_2\}$, $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ functions $\{\gamma_w,\, \gamma_v\}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ function φ_2 satisfy the additional condition:*

$$\mu_1\left(3s + 3\mu_2^{-1}\left(3\mu_2(s)\right)\right)\varphi_1(T_{\eta,\bar{s}}) + \alpha_1\left(3\gamma_w^{-1}\left(3\mu_2(s)\varphi_2(T_{\eta,\bar{s}})\right)\right) + \alpha_2\left(3\gamma_v^{-1}\left(3\mu_2(s)\varphi_2(T_{\eta,\bar{s}})\right)\right) \leq \eta s, \quad (15)$$

for all $s \in [0,\, \bar{s}]$ and $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$.

Proof: By referring to the proof of Corollary 1, we see that the given conditions excluding (15) imply that the associated FIE satisfies Assumptions IV.1-IV.2. To prove the conclusion by Theorem 2, it is sufficient to show that inequality (15) implies inequality (14). From the proof of Corollary 1, we notice that $\rho_x(s,\, t) := \mu_2(s)\varphi_2(t)$ and $\bar{\beta}_x(s,t) = \beta\left(3s + 3\mu_2^{-1}\left(3\mu_2(s)\right),\, t\right) = \mu_1\left(3s + 3\mu_2^{-1}\left(3\mu_2(s)\right)\right)\varphi_1(t)$. Substituting these specific $\mathcal{KL}$ functions into (15), yields (14) and hence completes the proof. ∎

Corollary 5. *Given Assumption V.1 and an $\eta \in (0,\, 1)$, the MHE is RGAS for all $T \geq T_{\eta,\bar{s}}$ if its associated FIE satisfies conditions a)-c) of Corollary 2 in which the $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ functions $\{\gamma_w,\, \gamma_v\}$ and the $\mathcal{K}$ functions $\{\alpha_1,\, \alpha_2\}$ satisfy the additional condition:*

$$c_1\left[3\left(1 + {}^{a_2}\sqrt{3}\right)\right]^{a_1} s^{a_1}\left(T_{\eta,\bar{s}} + 1\right)^{-b_1} + \alpha_1\left(3\gamma_w^{-1}\left(3c_2 s^{a_2}\left(T_{\eta,\bar{s}} + 1\right)^{-b_2}\right)\right) + \alpha_2\left(3\gamma_v^{-1}\left(3c_2 s^{a_2}\left(T_{\eta,\bar{s}} + 1\right)^{-b_2}\right)\right) \leq \eta s, \quad (16)$$

for all $s \in [0,\, \bar{s}]$ and $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$.

Proof: With $\mu_1(s) = c_1 s^{a_1}$, $\mu_2(s) = c_2 s^{a_2}$, $\varphi_1(t) = (t+1)^{-b_1}$ and $\varphi_2(t) = (t+1)^{-b_2}$, it is straightforward to show that (16) is equivalent to (15). Since the remaining conditions of Corollary 4 are satisfied when conditions a)-c) of Corollary 2 hold true, the conclusion follows by Corollary 4. ∎

Note that, to satisfy inequality (16), the parameter a_1 of the i-IOSS system must satisfy $a_1 \geq 1$.

Corollary 6. *Given Assumption V.1 and an $\eta \in (0,\, 1)$, the MHE is RGAS for all $T \geq T_{\eta,\bar{s}}$ if the associated FIE satisfies conditions a)-c) of Corollary 3 in which the $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ functions $\{\gamma_w,\, \gamma_v\}$ and the $\mathcal{K}$ functions $\{\alpha_1,\, \alpha_2\}$ satisfy the additional condition:*

$$c_1\left[3\left(1 + {}^{a_2}\sqrt{3}\right)\right]^{a_1} s^{a_1} b_1^{T_{\eta,\bar{s}}} + \alpha_1\left(3\gamma_w^{-1}\left(3c_2 s^{a_2} b_2^{T_{\eta,\bar{s}}}\right)\right) + \alpha_2\left(3\gamma_v^{-1}\left(3c_2 s^{a_2} b_2^{T_{\eta,\bar{s}}}\right)\right) \leq \eta s, \quad (17)$$

for all $s \in [0,\, \bar{s}]$ and $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$.

Proof: With $\mu_1(s) = c_1 s^{a_1}$, $\mu_2(s) = c_2 s^{a_2}$, $\varphi_1(t) = b_1^t$ and $\varphi_2(t) = b_2^t$, it is straightforward to show that (17) is equivalent to (15). Since the remaining conditions of Corollary 4 are satisfied when conditions a)-c) of Corollary 3 hold true, the conclusion follows by Corollary 4. ∎

Analog to the case of FIE, a specific sub-cost function $\bar{V}_t$ for MHE to satisfy the conditions of Corollary 5 or 6 can take the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1},\, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}) \\ &:= \frac{\lambda_w}{T}\sum_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}_{t-T:t-1}} l_{w,\tau}(\omega_\tau) + \frac{\lambda_v}{T+1}\sum_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}_{t-T:t}} l_{v,\tau}(\nu_\tau) \\ &+ (1-\lambda_w)\max_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}_{t-T:t-1}} l_{w,\tau}(\omega_\tau) + (1-\lambda_v)\max_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}_{t-T:t}} l_{w,\tau}(\nu_\tau),\end{aligned}$$

with given constants λ_w, $\lambda_v \in [0, 1)$. Here the functions $l_{w,\tau}$ and $l_{v,\tau}$ are bounded as per (12), and the resulting $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ bound functions $\{\gamma_w, \gamma_v\}$ which are associated with $\bar{V}_t$ satisfy inequality (16) (or (17)) of Corollary 5 (or 6).

VI. Numerical Examples

This section applies MHE to estimate the states of a linear system and a nonlinear system. The two systems are provable to be i-IOSS, and were subject to Gaussian disturbances which were truncated to the range of $[-3\sigma, 3\sigma]$, with σ^2 representing the variance of a disturbance. The performances of MHE are compared with those of KF in the linear case and EKF in the nonlinear case. The performance was evaluated by the mean absolute error (MAE) of estimation, as defined below:

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{N(t_f+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=0}^{t_f} \sum_{j=1}^{n} |x_{t,j}^{(i)} - \hat{x}_{t,j}^{(i)}|,$$

where t_f is the simulation duration, N is the number of instances of the disturbance sequence, $x_{t,j}^{(i)}$ is the jth state of a state vector $x_t^{(i)}$ for time t in instance i, and $\hat{x}_{t,j}^{(i)}$ denotes the corresponding estimate. In both examples, we set $N = 100$ and $t_f = 60$.

A. A linear system

Consider a linear discrete-time system described by:

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{1,t+1} \\ x_{2,t+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.3 \\ -0.1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,t} \\ x_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} w_{1,t} \\ w_{2,t} \end{bmatrix},$$
$$y_t = x_{2,t} + v_t, \ \forall t \geq 0.$$

The disturbances $\{w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}\}$ and noise $\{v_t\}$ are three sequences of independent, zero mean, truncated Gaussian noises with variances given by $\sigma_{w_1}^2 = \sigma_{w_2}^2 = \sigma_w^2 = 0.04$ and $\sigma_v^2 = 0.01$, respectively. The prior estimate of the initial state is given as $\bar{x}_0 = [1 \ -1]^\top$. The actual initial state x_0 is a random variable independent of the disturbances and noise, and follows a Gaussian distribution with a mean of $\bar{x}_0$ and the variances of the two elements are both given by $\sigma_0^2 := 1$.

The system is exp-i-IOSS by Lemma 4 established in the Appendix. By the definition of an i-IOSS system in (1), the $\mathcal{KL}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ bound functions are obtained as $\beta(s, t) = 2.61s \cdot 0.94^t$, $\alpha_1(s) = 37.4s$ and $\alpha_2(s) \equiv 0$. By Corollary 6, for the MHE to be RGAS we can specify its cost function as

$$\begin{aligned} &V_t(\chi_{t-T}, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}) \\ &:= \frac{|\chi_{t-T} - \hat{x}_{t-T}|^2 b_2^T}{\sigma_0^2} + \bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}), \ \text{with} \quad (18) \\ &\bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}) \\ &:= \frac{\lambda_w}{\sigma_w^2 T} \sum_{\tau=t-T}^{t-1} |\omega_\tau|^2 + \frac{\lambda_v}{\sigma_v^2(T+1)} \sum_{\tau=t-T}^{t} |\nu_\tau|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1-\lambda_w}{\sigma_w^2} \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}\|^2 + \frac{1-\lambda_v}{\sigma_v^2} \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}\|^2. \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

The resulting MHE is named as MHE I, to distinguish it from another MHE as defined later. With this choice of cost function, the $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ bound functions associated with the disturbances are derived as $\gamma_w(s) = (1-\lambda_w)s^2/\sigma_w^2$, $\gamma_w(s) = s^2/\sigma_w^2$, $\gamma_v(s) = (1-\lambda_v)s^2/\sigma_v^2$, and $\gamma_v(s) = s^2/\sigma_v^2$. To satisfy the stability conditions of Corollary 6, it suffices to choose $b_2 = 0.9$ and λ_w, $\lambda_v \in [0, 1)$, satisfying $0.94^2 \leq b_2 < 1$. Given a moving horizon size specified by T, we solve the MHE subject to $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}\| \leq 3\sigma_w$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}\| \leq 3\sigma_v$, yielding the state estimate for each $t \in \mathbb{I}_{0:t_f}$.



Fig. 1: Performance of MHE vs. the values of T and b_2. In (a), MHE I was implemented with $b_2 = 0.9$ and MHE II with $b_2 = 0.12$, and in (b) both MHEs had $T = 15$. The shaded areas in (b) show the ranges of b_2 that meet the stability conditions of MHEs I and II as identified by Corollaries 6 and 5, respectively.

The MAEs of the estimates when b_2 and T took different values are shown in Fig. 1. It is observed that MHE I with $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0.99$ outperformed KF if the horizon size T and the parameter b_2 were large enough. Whereas, MHE I was inferior to KF when $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0$, regardless of the values of T and b_2. The observations are verified by the results of a random instance, as shown in Fig. 2. We see that MHE I outperformed KF during the early stage of estimation and became almost equivalent to KF afterwards. In addition, the results in Fig. 1 indicate that a small moving horizon size, e.g., $T = 10$, is sufficient for the MHE to offer a good estimation, and that the improvement in the estimation performance is marginal once the horizon is large enough. The feasible size can thus be smaller than the sufficient size predicted by Corollary 6, which is 75 for $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0$ and 114 for $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0.99$.

Alternatively, if the i-IOSS property is expressed by using a looser $\mathcal{KL}$ bound with $\beta(s, t) := 2.61s \cdot (t+1)^{\ln 0.94}$, then by Corollary 5 a different cost function can be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} V_t'(\chi_{t-T}, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}) &= \frac{|\chi_{t-T} - \hat{x}_{t-T}|^2}{\sigma_0^2 (T+1)^{b_2}} \\ &+ \bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}), \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{V}_t(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t})$ is the same as in (19). To satisfy the stability conditions in Corollary 5, it is sufficient to choose $b_2 = 0.123$, which satisfies $0 < b_2 \leq -2 \ln 0.94$. We call the resulting MHE as MHE II. Simulations were performed on the same random instances for different values of T and b_2, and the results are again shown in Fig. 1. The state estimation results almost coincided with those obtained by MHE I for different values of T. Similar observations were also yielded when the parameters b_2's of the two MHEs took values in the corresponding ranges identified by Corollaries 5



Fig. 2: Performances of KF and MHE I. In (a)-(b), MHE I was implemented with $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0.99$, and in (c)-(d), MHE I was implemented with $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0$. In both cases, the two parameters were set as $T = 15$ and $b_2 = 0.9$. The bars indicate the variations bounded by the standard deviations.



Fig. 3: Performances of MHE and KF based on measurements with outliers. The results in (a)-(b) present the mean estimation errors, and those in (c)-(e) show the estimates obtained in a random instance.

and 6. Simulations also showed that both MHE I and MHE II remained stable even if b_2 took values beyond the identified ranges, which indicates the sufficiency but non-necessity of the derived stability conditions.

Next, we compare the performances of MHE and KF when the measurements had outliers. In this case, the noise was a mixture of two truncated Gaussian noises: a nominal noise had a variance of σ_v^2 which occurred with a probability of p, and an intermittent large noise had a variance of $100\sigma_v^2$ which occurred with a probability of $(1-p)$ [31]. The system disturbances $w_{1,t}$ and $w_{2,t}$ were generated as the same Gaussian disturbance with a variance of σ_w^2. In the simulation, we set $p = 0.9$, $\sigma_v = 0.1$ and $\sigma_w = 0.02$. The other simulation setting was the same as before. In this case, the cost function of the MHE was specified as

$$V_t(\chi_{t-T},\, \boldsymbol{\omega}_{t-T:t-1},\, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{t-T:t}) := \frac{|\chi_{t-T} - \hat{x}_{t-T}|^2 b_2^T}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_w^2 T}\sum_{\tau=t-T}^{t-1} |\omega_\tau|^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_v (T+1)}\sum_{\tau=t-T}^{t} |\nu_\tau|,$$

which imposes 1-norm instead of 2-norm penalties on the fitting errors $\{\nu_\tau\}_{t-T\le\tau\le t}$ in order to account for outliers in the measurements in a better manner [31]–[33]. The MHE also incorporates the knowledge of $w_{1,t}$ and $w_{2,t}$ being identical by including the equality constraints $\omega_{1,\tau} = \omega_{2,\tau}$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{I}_{t-T:t-1}$. In contrast, the KF fully implemented 2-norm penalties, while the knowledge that $w_{1,t}$ and $w_{2,t}$ are identical for all $t \ge 0$ was taken into account by specifying their covariance matrix as $\sigma_w^2 \mathbf{1}_2$, where $\mathbf{1}_2$ is a 2×2 matrix with all elements equal to one.

As shown in Fig. 3(a)-(b), the state estimates obtained by MHE outperformed those obtained by KF during the whole simulation period, in terms of both mean and variance of the estimation errors. Fig. 3(c)-(d) show the true trajectories of the two states and their associated KF and MHE estimates in a random instance. The results confirm the superiority of MHE in this case. Indeed, this owes to the more accurate recovery of the measurement noise realization by means of the 1-norm penalties applied on the measurement fitting errors. This is supported by the noise estimates shown in Fig. 3(e).

B. A nonlinear system

Consider a nonlinear continuous-time system described by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_{1,t} \\ \dot{x}_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -2kx_{1,t}^2 + w_t \\ kx_{1,t}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad y_t = x_{1,t} + x_{2,t} + v_t,\ \forall t \ge 0, \tag{21}$$

where $k = 0.16$. When w_t is constantly zero, the system describes an ideal gas-phase irreversible reaction in a well mixed, constant volume, isothermal batch reactor, where $x_{1,t}$ and $x_{2,t}$ represent the partial pressures and y_t the reactor pressure measurement [16], [34]. In normal operations, the states and measurements are non-negative, i.e., $x_{1,t}$, $x_{2,t}$, $y_t \ge 0$ for all $t \ge 0$. We assume that $x_{2,0} \ge c_0$ for a certain positive constant c_0. This implies that $x_{2,t} \ge c_0 > 0$ for all $t \ge 0$ because $x_{2,t}$ increases with t.

First we prove that the system is i-IOSS, which was often assumed without a proof in the literature, e.g., [16]. Given two initial conditions $x_0^{(1)} := [x_{1,0}^{(1)}\ x_{2,0}^{(1)}]^\top$ and $x_0^{(2)} := [x_{1,0}^{(2)}\ x_{2,0}^{(2)}]^\top$, let the corresponding state trajectory be denoted as $x_t^{(1)}$ and $x_t^{(2)}$. Define $\delta x_{1,t} = x_{1,t}^{(1)} - x_{1,t}^{(2)}$ and $p_t = |\delta x_{1,t}|$. The dynamics of p_t is then derived as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_t &= \frac{\delta x_{1,t}}{|\delta x_{1,t}|}\delta\dot{x}_{1,t} = \frac{\delta x_{1,t}}{|\delta x_{1,t}|}\left(-2k(x_{1,t}^{(1)} + x_{1,t}^{(2)})\delta x_{1,t} + \delta w_t\right) \\ &= -2k(x_{1,t}^{(1)} + x_{1,t}^{(2)})|\delta x_{1,t}| + \frac{\delta x_{1,t}}{|\delta x_{1,t}|}\delta w_t \\ &\le -2kc_0 p_t + |\delta w_t|. \end{aligned}$$



Fig. 4: Performances of EKF and MHE. (a) Average performances: the red dash-dot line is the results of EKF, and the blue dash and blue solid curves correspond to the results of MHE with λ_w and λ_v both equal to 0, and 0.99. (b) The estimation results of a random instance: the black solid curves represent the true states, the blue dash and red dash-dot curves correspond to the MHE and the EKF estimates. The thinner and the thicker curves refer to states x_1 and x_2, respectively.

By the comparison lemma (Lemma 3.4 of [26]), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\delta x_{1,t}| = p_t &\le p_0 e^{-2kc_0 t} + \int_0^t e^{-2kc_0(t-\tau)}|\delta w_\tau| d\tau \\ &\le |\delta x_{1,0}| e^{-2kc_0 t} + \frac{1-e^{-2kc_0 t}}{2kc_0}\|\delta \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t}\| \\ &\le |\delta x_0| e^{-2kc_0 t} + \frac{\|\delta \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t}\|}{2kc_0}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the gap between the two full states is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&|x_t^{(1)} - x_t^{(2)}| \le |\delta x_{1,t}| + |\delta x_{2,t}| \le 2\,|\delta x_{1,t}| + |\delta(y_t - v_t)| \\ &\le 2|\delta x_0| e^{-2kc_0 t} + \frac{\|\delta \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t}\|}{kc_0} + \|\delta(\boldsymbol{y}_{0:t} - \boldsymbol{v}_{0:t})\| \\ &=: \beta(|\delta x_0|,\, t) + \alpha_1\left(\|\delta \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t}\|\right) + \alpha_2\left(\|\delta(\boldsymbol{y}_{0:t} - \boldsymbol{v}_{0:t})\|\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}$. Thus, the system described in (21) is i-IOSS by Definition 2.

Let w_t and v_t be Gaussian white noises, both with variances equal to 0.01, i.e., $\sigma_w^2 = \sigma_v^2 = 0.01$. And let the initial state x_0 follow a Gaussian distribution with a mean of $[0.1,\ 4.5]$ and a covariance of $\sigma_0^2 I_2$, where $\sigma_0^2 = 9$ and I_2 is a 2×2 identify matrix. In simulations, the state trajectory of the system was generated by the continuous-time state equations in (21), and then the states were estimated by EKF and MHE using online measurements that were sampled at a period of T_s. According to Corollary 6, the MHE in discrete time is RGAS when the moving horizon size T is large enough, if its cost function takes the form of (18)-(19) and is equipped with $b_2 = e^{-4kc_0 T_s}$. With $c_0 = 0.1$ and $T_s = 0.1$, Monte-Carlo simulations were performed for T varying from 2 to 30 and the average state estimation results are shown in Fig. 4(a). As observed, MHE outperformed EKF once the moving horizon size T is larger than 2 for $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0.99$ and 4 for $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0$. The observations were reflected in the results of a random instance as shown in Fig. 4(a), in which the prior estimate of the initial state was given by $[4.5,\ 0.1]$ and the MHE parameters were chosen as $\lambda_w = \lambda_v = 0.99$ and $T = 15$.

VII. Conclusion

This paper proved the robust global asymptotic stability (RGAS) of full information estimation (FIE) and its practical approximation, moving horizon estimation (MHE) under general settings. The results indicate that both FIE and MHE lead to bounded estimation errors under mild conditions for an incrementally input/output-to-state stable (i-IOSS) system subjected to bounded system and measurement disturbances. The stability conditions require that the cost function to be optimized has a property resembling the i-IOSS property of a system, but with a higher sensitivity to the uncertainty in the initial state. The stability of MHE additionally requires that the moving horizon is long enough to suppress temporal propagation of the estimator errors.

When dealing with constrained nonlinear systems, MHE has to solve a non-convex program at each estimation point. Searching for a global optimal solution to the program requires considerable computational resources which are often unaffordable in applications. This problem has motivated considerable efforts to develop robustly stable MHE that relies on a sub-optimal but computationally efficient solution of the program. Further research is demanded to develop a systematic and practical solution for this equally important problem.

Appendix: A supporting lemma and its proof

Lemma 4. *Consider a system described by* (2)*, where $f(x_t,\, w_t) = Ax_t + g(x_t) + w_t$ with g being a nonlinear function, and h is a linear or nonlinear measurement function. Suppose that A is diagonalizable as $P^{-1}\Lambda P$ for a certain non-singular matrix P and a diagonal matrix Λ. If the spectrum radius of A, denoted by $\rho(A)$, is less than one and the nonlinear functions satisfy $|g(x_t^{(1)}) - g(x_t^{(2)})| \le L|h(x_t^{(1)}) - h(x_t^{(2)})|$ for all admissible $x_t^{(1)}$ and $x_t^{(2)}$ and a positive constant L, then the system is exp-i-IOSS as per* (1)*, in which the $\mathcal{KL}$ function can be specified as $\beta(s,\, t) = |P^{-1}||P| s\rho^t(A) \le c_1 s(t+1)^{-b_1}$ for all $s,\, t \ge 0$, and the $\mathcal{K}$ functions as $\alpha_1(s) = \frac{|P^{-1}||P|}{1-\rho(A)} \cdot s$ and $\alpha_2(s) = \frac{L|P^{-1}||P|}{1-\rho(A)} \cdot s$ for all $s \ge 0$. Here the parameters b_1 and c_1 are positive constants satisfying $c_1 \ge \max_{t \in \mathbb{I}_{\ge 0}} |P^{-1}||P|\rho^t(A)(t+1)^{b_1}$.*

Proof: Given two initial conditions $x_0^{(1)}$ and $x_0^{(2)}$ and corresponding disturbance sequences $\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(2)}$, let the system states at time t be yielded as $x_t^{(1)}$ and $x_t^{(2)}$, respectively. By using the analytical expressions of the two states, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|x_t^{(1)} - x_t^{(2)}| \\ &= \left| A^t(x_0^{(1)} - x_0^{(2)}) + \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} A^{t-1-l}\left(g(x_l^{(1)}) + w_l^{(1)} - g(x_l^{(2)}) - w_l^{(2)}\right)\right| \\ &\le |A^t||x_0^{(1)} - x_0^{(2)}| + \begin{pmatrix} \|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(2)}\| \\ +\|g(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t-1}^{(1)}) - g(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t-1}^{(2)})\| \end{pmatrix} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} |A^k| \\ &\le |P^{-1}||P| \begin{pmatrix} \rho^t(A)|x_0^{(1)} - x_0^{(2)}| \\ + \begin{pmatrix} \|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(2)}\| \\ +L\|h(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t-1}^{(1)}) - h(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t-1}^{(2)})\| \end{pmatrix} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \rho^k(A) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\le |P^{-1}||P| \begin{pmatrix} \rho^t(A)|x_0^{(1)} - x_0^{(2)}| + \frac{1}{1-\rho(A)}\|\boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{w}_{0:t-1}^{(2)}\| \\ + \frac{L}{1-\rho(A)}\|h(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t}^{(1)}) - h(\boldsymbol{x}_{0:t}^{(2)})\| \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality implies that the system is i-IOSS and in particular exp-i-IOSS by Definition 2, in which the $\mathcal{KL}$ function β and the $\mathcal{K}$ functions $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ are specified by the lemma. Given $b_1 \geq 0$, define $c_{1,\min}^{b_1} = \max_{t\in\mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}} |P^{-1}||P|\rho^t(A)(t+1)^{b_1}$. Since the maximum exists while $\rho(A) < 1$, $c_{1,\min}^{b_1}$ is well defined. Therefore, there always exists $c_1 \geq c_{1,\min}^{b_1}$ such that $|P^{-1}||P|\rho^t(A) \leq c_1(t+1)^{-b_1}$ for all $t \geq 0$. The conclusions of the lemma follows immediately. ∎

By the lemma, if a system is exp-i-IOSS with the $\mathcal{KL}$ bound function given as $\beta(s,\, t) = c_1 s^{a_1} b_1^t$ for certain positive constants a_1, b_1 and c_1 with $b_1 < 1$, then it is always feasible to specify a looser $\mathcal{KL}$ bound function as $\beta'(s,\, t) = c_1' s^{a_1}(t+1)^{-b_1'}$ for certain positive constants b_1' and c_1' satisfying $c_1' \geq \max_{t\in\mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}} c_1 b_1^t (t+1)^{b_1'}$. For example, if b_1' is set to 1, then c_1' can be specified as $\max c_1 b_1^t(t+1)$ which exists for $t \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ when $0 \leq b_1 < 1$. For another example, if b_1' is set to $-\ln b_1$, then c_1' can be specified as equal to c_1 (which is equal to $\max_{t\in\mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}} c_1 b_1^t (t+1)^{-\ln b_1}$).

REFERENCES

[1] J. B. Rawlings, "Moving horizon estimation," *Encyclopedia of Systems and Control*, pp. 1–7, 2014.

[2] A. Jazwinski, "Limited memory optimal filtering," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 558–563, 1968.

[3] K. R. Muske and J. B. Rawlings, "Nonlinear moving horizon state estimation," in *Methods of Model Based Process Control*, 1995, pp. 349–365.

[4] F. Allgöwer, T. A. Badgwell, J. S. Qin, J. B. Rawlings, and S. J. Wright, "Nonlinear predictive control and moving horizon estimation–an introductory overview," in *Advances in Control*, 1999, pp. 391–449.

[5] J. Rawlings and L. Ji, "Optimization-based state estimation: Current status and some new results," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 22, pp. 1439–1444, 2012.

[6] K. R. Muske, J. B. Rawlings, and J. H. Lee, "Receding horizon recursive state estimation," in *American Control Conference (ACC)*, San Francisco, CA, USA, Jun 1993, pp. 900–904.

[7] C. V. Rao, J. B. Rawlings, and J. H. Lee, "Constrained linear state estimation–a moving horizon approach," *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1619–1628, 2001.

[8] A. Alessandri, M. Baglietto, and G. Battistelli, "Receding-horizon estimation for discrete-time linear systems," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 473–478, 2003.

[9] H. Michalska and D. Q. Mayne, "Moving horizon observers and observer-based control," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 995–1006, 1995.

[10] A. Alessandri, M. Baglietto, T. Parisini, and R. Zoppoli, "A neural state estimator with bounded errors for nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 2028–2042, 1999.

[11] C. Rao, J. Rawlings, and D. Mayne, "Constrained state estimation for nonlinear discrete-time systems: Stability and moving horizon approximations," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 246–258, 2003.

[12] A. Alessandri, M. Baglietto, and G. Battistelli, "Moving-horizon state estimation for nonlinear discrete-time systems: New stability results and approximation schemes," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 1753–1765, 2008.

[13] A. Alessandri, M. Baglietto, G. Battistelli, and V. Zavala, "Advances in moving horizon estimation for nonlinear systems," in *The 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, Dec. 2010, pp. 5681–5688.

[14] J. Liu, "Moving horizon state estimation for nonlinear systems with bounded uncertainties," *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, vol. 93, pp. 376–386, 2013.

[15] W. Hu, L. Xie, and K. You, "Optimization-based state estimation under bounded disturbances," in *The 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Osaka, Japan, Dec 2015.

[16] L. Ji, J. B. Rawlings, W. Hu, A. Wynn, and M. Diehl, "Robust stability of moving horizon estimation under bounded disturbances," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 3509 – 3514, 2016.

[17] M. A. Müller, "Nonlinear moving horizon estimation for systems with bounded disturbances," in *American Control Conference (ACC)*, Boston, USA, Jul 2016, pp. 883–888.

[18] E. Sontag and Y. Wang, "Output-to-state stability and detectability of nonlinear systems," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 279–290, 1997.

[19] J. B. Rawlings and D. Q. Mayne, *Model Predictive Control: Theory and Design*. Madison, WI: Nob Hill Pub., 2009.

[20] V. M. Zavala, C. D. Laird, and L. T. Biegler, "A fast moving horizon estimation algorithm based on nonlinear programming sensitivity," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 876–884, 2008.

[21] P. Kühl, M. Diehl, T. Kraus, J. P. Schlöder, and H. G. Bock, "A real-time algorithm for moving horizon state and parameter estimation," *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 71–83, 2011.

[22] R. López-Negrete and L. T. Biegler, "A moving horizon estimator for processes with multi-rate measurements: A nonlinear programming sensitivity approach," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 677–688, 2012.

[23] A. Wynn, M. Vukov, and M. Diehl, "Convergence guarantees for moving horizon estimation based on the real-time iteration scheme," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 2215–2221, 2014.

[24] A. Alessandri and M. Gaggero, "Moving-horizon estimation for discrete-time linear and nonlinear systems using the gradient and newton methods," in *IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Melbourne, Australia, Dec. 2016, pp. 2906–2911.

[25] L. Ljung, "Asymptotic behavior of the extended kalman filter as a parameter estimator for linear systems," *IEEE Trans. on Autom. Control*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 36–50, 1979.

[26] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002.

[27] L. Grüne, "Input-to-state stability of exponentially stabilized semilinear control systems with inhomogeneous perturbations," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 27–35, 1999.

[28] B. Liu, D. J. Hill, and Y. Sun, "Exponential input-to-state stability for hybrid dynamical networks via impulsive interconnection," in *The 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, Dec 2010, pp. 673–678.

[29] E. D. Sontag, "Comments on integral variants of ISS," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 93–100, 1998.

[30] M. D. Glas, "Exponential stability revisited," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 1505–1510, 1987.

[31] A. Aravkin, J. V. Burke, L. Ljung, A. Lozano, and G. Pillonetto, "Generalized kalman smoothing: Modeling and algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.06369*, 2016.

[32] Q. Ke and T. Kanade, "Robust L1 norm factorization in the presence of outliers and missing data by alternative convex programming," in *IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, Seattle, WA, USA, Jun 2005.

[33] J. D. Hedengren and A. N. Eaton, "Overview of estimation methods for industrial dynamic systems," *Optimization and Engineering*, pp. 1–24, 2015.

[34] E. Haseltine and J. Rawlings, "Critical evaluation of extended kalman filtering and moving-horizon estimation," *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 2451–2460, 2005.

Wuhua Hu received the BEng degree in Automation in 2005 and the MEng degree in Detecting Technique and Automation Device in 2007 from Tianjin University, China. He received the PhD degree in Communication Engineering from Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore, in 2012. He is currently a Research Scientist with the Institute for Infocomm Research, Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), Singapore. Before joining A*STAR, he worked as a Research Fellow first with the School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering and then the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, NTU, Singapore, from Aug 2011 to Mar 2016. His research interests lie in modeling, estimation, control and optimization of dynamical systems, with applications for smart and greener power and energy systems.